



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XVIII.

JULY, 1917

No. 3

THE ORANGE QUARTER AND THE FIRST FRENCH SETTLERS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

BY HENRY A. M. SMITH

The late Genl. Edward McCrady whose work published in 1897 may be regarded as the latest authoritative history of the period, gives the following account of the first French settlers:

"In the redistribution of the lots in old Charles Town, Richard Batin, Jacques Jours, and Richard Deyos received town lots. "These are assumed to have been French Protestants, but upon "what authority is not known. In 1677 grants were made to "Jean Batton; in 1678 to Jean Bazant and Richard Gaillard. "These were the first Huguenots in Carolina of whom there is "record."¹

McCrady gives as his authority for this, Howe's History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina, which was published in 1870. Howe (vol. 1, p. 73) gives practically the same account as repeated by McCrady, adding to the supposed first French Huguenots, John Monke in 1682, and a grant "to Marie Batton wife of "Jean Batton (ci-devant Mary Fosteen)."

On a later page (p. 101) Howe mentions as one of the probable French Huguenots to whom lots were granted in old Charles

¹ So: *Ca: under the Proprietary Govt., 1670-1716*, pp. 180-181.

Town, James Jour (not Jacques Jours). He also adds to the list of French immigrants to whom early grants were given, Jean Bullon (not Batton) in 1677, to Lydia Barnott in 1678, to Pierre Bodit in 1678 and to Samuel Buttall in 1682. Howe does not give his authority but the writer surmises that he may have seen the MS. history of the Huguenots of South Carolina and their descendants compiled by the late Thomas Gaillard, who in 1832 removed from South Carolina to Alabama. Mr. Gaillard seems to have done considerable research work (of a desultory kind) in the South Carolina records. Copious extracts from this MS. were published in the transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina for 1897. Most of the names given by Howe and McCrady as early French grantees of lands are given by Mr. Gaillard.

A close examination of the original records shows the assumption that these early grantees were French is probably a mistake.

The three names given as persons to whom lots were awarded at the redistribution in old Charles Town are Richard Batin, Jacques Jours or James Jour, and Richard Deyos. A list of the persons to whom these lots were awarded will be found in the *Collections of the Historical Society of S. C.*, vol. 5, p. 408, and also more exactly in the *Journal of the Grand Council* printed by the Historical Commission of S. C. in 1907 pp. 40-41. The most careful search reveals no Jacques Jours or James Jour, but one James Jones receives lot 14. Richard Battin receives lot 13, and Richard Deyos lot 19. As to Richard Battin a person of that name came out to Carolina in August 1671 in the ship *Blessing* from England with a shipload of English and Irish emigrants,² who together with a fellow emigrant in the same ship, one William Loe, stole a quantity of chattels and ran away from the settlement, were captured, tried, and condemned to death, and reprieved only on the intercession of Lady Yeamans and the rest of the ladies of the colony; and in June 1673 Richard Battin, joiner, was for malicious scandal ordered to receive thirteen lashes on his naked back "well laid on."³ In 1677 a warrant for 100 acres is issued to Richard Batten and Rebecca (not Marie) his wife.⁴ There is no

² *Coll^{ns} Hist: Soc:* vol. 5, p. 329.

³ Printed *Journal of Grand Council*, pp. 54, 55, 58.

⁴ *Printed Warrants*, 1672, p. 147.

reason then to infer that that Richard Batten or Battin was other than one of the first English emigrants.

Richard Deyos or Dyas was a gunner on the ship *Carolina* on her very first trip to found the settlement in August 1669.⁵ In March 1670/71 he is mentioned as a seaman belonging to the *Carolina*, but as having property in the Province.⁶ He arrived in the settlement in the very first fleet and brought with him or procured by June 1670 an indentured servant named Christopher Edwards⁷ and in December 1672 received a warrant for 300 acres.⁸ It is difficult to suppose at that time a seaman on an English vessel as an alien Frenchman. The suggestion of his being French is but a guess from the spelling of his name than which with regard to English names no guess can be more unsafe. The writer has been able to find no warrant or grant to any Jean Bullon, nor to Jean Batton, nor to Marie Batton cidevant Mary Fosteen. Lydia Barnett received a warrant for 100 acres on 7 Sept^r. 1678⁹ but that does not make her French more than Lidia Bassett to whom with her husband John Bassett a warrant for 140 acres was issued on 4th September 1675 as having arrived in August 1672, or than Lydia Bezant to whom with her husband John Bezant a warrant for 140 acres issued on 7th Sept^r. 1678. The probability is (under the errors that distinguished the scribes of that date in the writing of personal names) that John and Lydia Barnett, Bassett, or Bezant, were the same two who arrived with the other English settlers in August 1672.¹⁰ No warrant or grant to "Jean" Bazant has been found by the writer. No "Pierre" Bodit appears. A warrant to "Peter" Bodit "one of y^e freemen of this province" for 600 acres was issued 13 July 1678.¹¹ John Monk was an Englishman from Kingsclere¹², and Samuel Buttall was also an Englishman from Battersea near London¹³. So that of all the names mentioned

⁵ *Coll^{ns} of the Hist: Soc: of S. C.*, vol 5, p. 141.

⁶ *Ibid*, p. 300.

⁷ *Printed Journals of Grand Council*, p. 34.

⁸ *Printed Warrants, 1672-1679*, p. 55.

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 175.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 100, 101, 175, 178.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p. 167.

¹² *S. C. Hist: and Gen: Mag:* vol XIV, p. 139.

¹³ Deed in possession of writer.

by Tho^s Gaillard, and by Howe, and McCrady after him, and by a number of "thesis" writers and pamphleteers after them, as presumed French, there remains but one that can plausibly be supposed such: viz "Richard Gilliard" to whom a warrant was issued for 100 acres on 2nd November 1678.¹⁴ The Gaillard family who a few years later are found in South Carolina were undoubtedly French Protestants. The name in South Carolina has been pronounced "Gilyard" so that the name of Richard Gilliard is written in the record we have of the warrant, as the name is here pronounced. Richard however is not among the family names of the subsequent Gaillards. He may have been of a family originally French but already anglicised for generations. The writer has found nothing more of him on the record than this entry of a warrant issued for 100 acres to him. Assuming that he was French he is the only name the writer has found on the record prior to 1680 that may with any certainty be classed as such. There are other names of uncertain class. Bevin, Allouron, and Shugeron to whom warrants are issued might be supposed to have a French flavour yet they are all apparently Irish, (viz "Teigue" Shugeron) who came out with Capt Florence O'Sullivan in the first fleet in 1670.¹⁵ There are other names to whom warrants were issued prior to 1680 which at first sight the writer thought might be French viz Davith Dupeth and Enoch Dupis in 1677, Vera Aurora Peper in 1678, and Deoniz Brodie in 1679,¹⁶ or M^r Ohohj (save that his name was Patrick) in 1679,¹⁷ together with several others, but none of them seem to "connect up" with the later French settlers and the writer's own conclusion is that the most reasonable inference is that they were all part of the English, Irish, Bermudian, Barbadian first settlement of the Province. Considering this and the subsequent expressions in the Statutes and other records concerning the advent of French and other alien settlers it would appear to be safe to infer that there were no French settlers in the Province prior to 1680.

In 1680 came the first definite French immigration, about which

¹⁴ *Printed Warrants, 1672-1679*, p. 186.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, p. 104.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 152, 179, 203.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, p. 205.

also a curious error (in an immaterial point) has found currency. If an error, especially an historical or genealogical error, once creeps into print it seems impossible ever to obliterate it. It continues to crop up again and again, each new repetition serving as an additional basis or "authority." The historian George Chalmers in his *Political Annals of the United Colonies* published in London in 1780 stated that King Charles II in April 1679 ordered *two* small vessels to transport at his expense several foreign protestants to Carolina. Following Chalmers, David Ramsay in his *History of South Carolina* makes the same statement, as does Bancroft, and W^m Gilmore Simms. Howe in his *History of the Presbyterian Church in S. C.* published in 1870 states (on p. 73) "his majesty Charles II gave orders for fitting out two "suitable ships for their conveyance. One of these vessels was "the frigate Richmond which arrived in 1680 bringing out forty-five French refugees. Charles himself bore the expense of their "transportation. A more considerable number soon followed in "another vessel, also at the expense of government."

General M^cCrady follows Howe with some amplification. The error referred to in these accounts is that the French emigrants referred to came in *two* vessels, a considerable number following those, who first come over in the frigate Richmond. From the original material now available we find the true account to be as follows.

On 10 Feby 1679 Mons^r René Petit petitioned his Majesty Charles II that four score Protestant families skilled in the manufacture of silks, oils, wines, &c. be transported to Carolina in two of his Majesty's small ships and £2000 be advanced for this purpose to be reimbursed from the receipts from the customs on the commodities of that plantation. In March 1679 an additional petition was presented from René Petit and Jacob Guérard setting out further reasons and praying despatch. Gen^l. M^cCrady gives this last name as "Grinard" a mistake due to the misspelling in the abstract given in Vol. 1 p. 102 of the *Collections of the Historical Society of S. C.*, of the petition which he refers to as his authority, and where the name is given as Grinard. It was without question Guérard. Before action on these petitions the Board of Lords of Trade and Plantations before whom the petitions were considered referred them to the Lords Proprietors of Carolina for their con-

sent. On 6 March 1679 the Lords Proprietors informed the Board that at an outlay of some £17000. to £18000. they had brought the Colony to so prosperous a condition that for years men of estates had gone there on their own account, but admit that both their interest and his Majesty's will be served by the coming of these foreigners to Carolina and the attraction their success will hold out to other foreigners and Protestants. That these "poor gentlemen" are fit objects of the King's goodness and that the outlay will be profitable.

Two things are to be noticed in this communication of the Lords Proprietors. 1st The coming of these "foreigners" to Carolina is spoken of as the first occasion of the kind, thus confirming the inference already drawn that no French came prior to this date, and 2nd they are referred to as "poor gentlemen."

On the same date (6 March) there are further "Humble proposals for Carolina" in the handwriting of René Petit to the effect that 50 or 60 foreign families (a fall from the first 80) are ready to ship in February 1680 and that his proposals are already agreed to by the Proprietors of Carolina. On 22 May 1679 the Board agreed to recommend the preparation of two ships to draw not more than twelve feet to transport the families—the families to victual themselves, and the King to be at no charge beyond maintaining the ships and their crews, and on 28 May it was so ordered, but nothing more seems to have been done until 17 October 1679 when René Petit the Kings agent at Rouen and Jacob Guérard Gentleman of Normandy petitioned that a certain number of the Protestant families already arrived in England may be shipped to Carolina on the Richmond frigate then about to go to Barbadoes and that a warrant for £2000. be made to the petitioners, one half to be received on arrival of the first batch of emigrants and the other half on arrival of the rest. On the 29 Octr this petition for the transport of several Protestant families to Carolina on the Richmond was granted.

On the 17 Decr 1679 the Lords Proprietors write to the Governor and Council of Carolina at Ashley River that by the same ship that carried the letter several foreign Protestant families went to Carolina to settle. They were to have the quantities of land granted directed in a previous letter of 19 May 1679 viz: To each free person male or female 70 acres of land with 70 acres more

for each manservant and 50 acres for each woman servant or manservant between the ages of 12 and 16. On expiration of their term of service each servant was to receive 60 acres. The Proprietors add in the letter that they have granted to René Petit and Jacob Guérard each a manor of 4000 acres to be passed to them as soon as desired. The letter is marked "Per the Richmond "frigate Capt: Dunbar commanding."¹⁸

The plan of sending *two* ships was changed and the ship Richmond alone made the transportation. Accompanying the Richmond on the voyage was M^r Thomas Ash "Gent." who was the Clerk on board. On his return he wrote a sketch entitled "Carolina; "or a Description of the Present State of that Country and the "Natural Excellencies thereof," which was published in London in 1682. In this sketch he states that a production of silk was well calculated to succeed in the Province and "To make tryal "of its Success was the Intention of those French Protestant Pas-sengers transported thither in His Majesties Frigat the Rich-mond being forty five, the half of a greater Number designed "for that place."

The Statute enacted by the General Assembly of Carolina 1 May 1691¹⁹ declares that King Charles "was pleased in the yeare "one thousand six hundred and eighty for the encouragement of "a Manufacture of silk oyle and wine to send in one of his owne "shipps of Warr several French Protestants into this Country, "to inhabitt and dwell in the same and their posterity after them."

From all which it may be inferred:

1—That the French immigrants in 1680 came in but one ship; the *Richmond*.

2—That they numbered in all but forty five.

3—That they were the first French to arrive in the colony and were brought to forward the colony's agriculture. The late M^r. Thomas Gaillard whose work on the French Huguenots of South Carolina has been already referred to; discussing this subject of the transportation in two vessels or one, refers to the statement as to two vessels in 1679 as first made by Chalmers and repeated

¹⁸ *Calendar of State Papers Am: and West Indies: vol: for 1677-1680*, pp. 328, 336, 337, 340, 351, 360, 364, 428, 435, 455. London MSS. in *Off: Hist: Com.*, vol 1, pp. 62-79.

¹⁹ *Stats at large*, vol. 2, p. 58.

in Bancroft and Simms, and concludes that finding no better authority than Chalmers for the statement he prefers the unquestionable authority of the Statute of 1691 that the transportation was made in 1680 in one vessel only.²⁰ The records in the State Paper Office in London to which M^r. Gaillard did not have access but which are now available show that his conclusion on this point was correct.

M^r. Gaillard also refers to the supposed early grants to French immigrants prior to 1680 already herein referred to and states "there is also on record an order to lay out to John Batton 70 "acres of land for Mary Batton his wife ci devant femme de "Fostien, she having arrived in May 1681. Order dated September 8th 1683."²¹

Reference however to the original record of the order of 18th (not 8th) September 1683 shows that there was to be "laid out "unto John Barton" (not Batton) "seaventy acres of land for "Mary his wife formerly knowne by the name of Mary Tosteen "arriving in May Annq: Dni 1681"—the *cidevant* femme de "Fostien" not appearing on the record.

These forty five in the ship *Richmond* having been the first French to arrive the writer has for years endeavoured to ascertain their names and place of settlement in the Province. There is no known list of the forty five in existence. None appears among the State papers from London, and the books of entry in which their names were registered when they came to the colony have apparently been all destroyed.

The sources of information for the names of the earliest French settlers are:

First. The names of persons to whom warrants for land were issued, or to whom actual grants were made. The list of grants we now have of that early period seems imperfect with a number of omissions. How many it is impossible to say. So too the warrant books containing the record of warrants issued omit the names of persons, to whom it is ascertained from the grants, that warrants must have been issued. The extent of these omissions is also unknown—probably not great. In determining from the

²⁰ *Transactions Huguenot Society of S. C. for 1897*, p. 10.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

name the nationality of the nominee, mistakes are apt to be made unless the person can be "checked up" from other sources, and circumstances. Some names are in orders or instructions sent direct from the Proprietors to the Governor and Council and are not on the Provincial registers of grants or warrants.

Second. The names contained in contemporaneous writings of which there are few, or mentioned in the recitals of boundaries in grants to other persons, or in the few remaining books of records of that date of wills and deeds of various kinds.

Third. The names contained in the list known as the "St: Julien" or "Ravenel" list. This is a list of French and Swiss refugees in Carolina who desired to be naturalized. Its date by comparison of names with births has been fixed at about 1696. It was found among the papers of Henry de St: Julien of St Johns Berkley who died in 1768 or 1769 and was the youngest son of Pierre de St: Julien mentioned in the list. His papers came into the possession of M^r. Daniel Ravenel of Wantoot and the list was first published in 1822 in the *Southern Intelligencer* a paper published in Charleston. It was republished in 1867 and again in pamphlet form by T. Gaillard Thomas M. D. in 1888; and in 1897 in the Transactions of the Huguenot Society of S. C. for that year. This list contains (as numbered in this last publication) 154 heads—so to say—of families. But there are a number of duplications in this list (about 28 according to the writer's count) which would reduce the names of heads of families to about 126. It is subdivided into 3 sublists, N^o. 2 of which contains the names of French who belonged to the Church at Orange Quarter.

Fourth. The list of names contained in the Act of the Provincial Assembly ratified 10th March 1696/7 entitled "An Act for making "Aliens free of this Part of the Province and for Granting Liberty "of Conscience to all Protestants."²² The Act contains a list of 63 names of which 56 appear to be French; and of these 56 names 36 are also included in the St: Julien list of persons who are "to "be" naturalized although the Act declares the 63 entitled to naturalization. The list of names in this Act is printed in alphabetical order in the Transactions of the Huguenot Society before referred to,²³ but was badly proof read as it has several errors in it.

²² *Stats. at Large*, Vol 2, p. 132.

²³ p. 240.

In the same number of the *Transactions of the Huguenot Society* there is given²⁴ another list of French names said to have been compiled by M^r. Thomas Gaillard of Mobile. This list although containing many French names is unworthy of reliance for any trustworthy historical or genealogical investigation. It is filled also with many names of persons known to have been English and even of Jews. It bears the evidence of wild guess and distorted inferences and is mentioned here only for the purpose of distinctly stating that it can not be included in any source for safe information concerning the names of French settlers.

The great bulk of the French immigration was apparently after 1685 when the Edict of Nantes was revoked. Not all the refugees with French names were French, some of them were Swiss, and by no means all came as the result of religious persecution. The Act of 1 May 1691 divides the Alien immigration into three classes:

1. French Protestants who had been compelled to flee to England.
2. The French Protestants whom King Charles II had brought over in 1680 for the encouragement of the manufacture of silk oil and wine.
3. Persons born in Switzerland who of late years had settled in the Province.

The Act of 10 March 1696/7 recites that, "Whereas Prosecution "for Religion hath forced some Aliens and trade and the fertility of this Colony has encouraged others to resort to this Colony" &c.

From all this we are to pick out the names of the first French immigrants viz: of those who came over on the ship *Richmond*,

The writer for years had an impression that those who came over on the *Richmond* were those who settled at Orange Quarter in what was subsequently the Parish of St: Denis. The reason for this supposition was that these immigrants were brought out for the very purpose of agricultural pursuits and the production of silk oil and wine; and that Samuel Wilson who wrote "An Account of the Province of Carolina" published in 1682²⁵ refers to the French settlement viz: "The Countrey hath gently rising

²⁴ Pp. 47 to 52.

²⁵ Carroll's *Hist: Coll^{ns} of S. C.*, vol 2, p. 19.

"Hills of fertile sand proper for Wines and further from the Sea
 "Rock and gravel, on which very good grapes grow naturally,
 "ripen well, and together, and very lushious in Taste, insomuch,
 "that the French Protestants who are there and skilled in wine
 "do no way doubt of producing great quantitys, and very good"

The French Protestants who "are there" means probably settled there.

A Samuel Wilson—possibly the author of the "Account"—obtained in 1684 a warrant, followed in 1688 by a grant, of 1000 acres on the Cooper River and the Creek afterwards known as French Quarter creek, which grant included what might have been called "a gently rising Hill" viz Ahagan Bluff,²⁶ and this in a loose indefinite way seemed to point to that section as the locality of the French settlement referred to by Wilson in 1682.

Subsequent investigation and a careful comparison of the names of the French settlers in that locality with the names of such as apparently came out on the Richmond has satisfied the writer that this impression of his was erroneous.

It has been shown that Jacob Guérard was with René Petit the petitioners for the transportation of those brought over on the Richmond, and that each Guérard and Petit were to receive a grant for 4000 acres.

On 16 Nov^r 1680 a warrant was issued to lay out to Jacob Guérard 4000 acres.²⁷ On the 18th of the succeeding February (1680/81) another warrant is issued to Jacob Guérard (spelled Garrard) in right of himself and wife for 560 acres due for the arrival of six servants viz Peter Oliver, Solomon Bremmer, Charles Fromagett, John Carier, Anna Lafelleine, and Mary Fortress.²⁸

On 24 April 1681 a warrant was issued to Peter Jacob Guérard (spelled Gerrard) Isack Guérard, John Guérard, Joseph Guérard, Margaret Guérard, and Elizabeth Guérard for 420 acres.²⁹ there is also a grant 18 Febry 1680 to M^{rs} Margret Petit for 70 acres.³⁰ The record does not show if she had any connection with René Petit. The Richmond appears to have sailed from England about

²⁶ *Proprietary Grants*, vol. 38, p. 69.

²⁷ *Printed Warrants*, 1680-1692, p. 26.

²⁸ *Ibid*, p. 31.

²⁹ *Ibid*, p. 39.

³⁰ *Ibid*, p. 29.

the end of December 1679 or the early part of January 1680. When she arrived in Carolina the writer has not been able to find noted on the record. It may be guessed at sometime in the Spring of 1680 unless she was compelled by stress of weather or other reasons to stop on the way. The letter of the Proprietors to lay out 4000 acres to Jacob Guérard which went by the Richmond was dated 17 Decr 1679 yet the warrant was not issued in Carolina until November 1680 so the vessel arrived sometime between those dates. On 1 November 1683 a warrant for 350 acres is issued to "Monsieur de la plane" (really Abraham Fleury de la Pleine) for himself and four servants arriving in April 1680;³¹ and on 25 February 1683/4 a warrant is issued to "Mouns^r Abraham de la plaine" for 200 acres due to him for the arrival of Lewis, Lucy, Sharto, and Gabriel Te boo (Thibou);³² while on 1 November 1683 a warrant is issued to Lewis Thibou for 210 acres due for himself and two servants arriving in April 1680;³³ and on 25 February 1683/4 a warrant for 210 acres is issued to James Varine for the arrival of himself his wife and son on the 29 April 1680.³⁴

Considering the connection between the names of Guérard and Petit with the immigrants on the Richmond, and the apparent coincidence of the dates of arrival of the other names mentioned with the probable date of arrival of the Richmond, the names mentioned are as close as the writer has been able to get to the probable names of the French Protestant passengers on that vessel. There were 7 Guérards: add Peter Olivier, Solomon Bremar and (according to the St Julien list) his wife Marie, Charles Fromagett, Jean Carriere, Anna Lafelleine and Mary Fortress (Marie Fougeraut?) 7 more making 14. Then Margaret Petit, Abraham Fleury with (according to the St Julien list) his daughter and son in law, and his brother Isaac Fleury, Louis Thibou, his wife (or daughter?) Charlotte (Sharto) and Louis Lucy and Gabrielle his children, Jacques Varin his wife and son 13 more or 27 in all. The same guess might apply to John Calley S^r John Calley J^r Walter Cañon and Edward Musson (Mouzon?) to whom warrants were issued, for the first three on

³¹ Ibid, p. 107.

³² Ibid, p. 123.

³³ Ibid, p. 138.

³⁴ Ibid, p. 121.

5 August 1680, and for Musson on 25 April 1681,³⁵ if only it could be safely inferred that they were French.

If the inference that these are persons who came on the ship *Richmond* be plausible then it would seem to dispose of the theory that the Orange Quarter was settled by the persons transported on that ship for not one of these names except that of Solomon Bremar is found as borne by the first French grantees of land in that quarter.

The first French name found by the writer in the vicinity of the Orange Quarter is that of Pierre Fouré. This name does not appear on either the St Julien list nor the Act of 1696: nor has the writer ever found any record of any warrant or grant issued to him. As stated in the account of Pompion Hill plantation published in this *Magazine*, Vol. XVIII, p. 18, his name is found on the early map of Carolina published in 1715 and his ownership is shown by the certificate of the late Daniel Ravenel that he had seen the grant to him with the transfer from him to Pierre St Julien de Malacare. St Julien was in possession in 1687, for according to the certificate of the Rev: M^r Trouillard, the marriage of his daughter to René Ravenel was in that year celebrated at Pompion Hill. Nicholas de Longuemare and Josias du Pré were present at the wedding as the friends and witnesses of Ravenel. Nicholas de Longuemare on the 5 Jan'y 1685 (1686) had received a warrant for 100 acres for which he afterwards received a grant near Fouré's grant, and Josias du Pré also later received a grant adjacent to de Longuemare. The St: Julien list gives as the French belonging to the Church at the Orange Quarter who desired naturalization:

Anthoine Poitevin and his wife.
 Daniel Trezevant and his wife
 Pierre Dutartre and his wife
 Anthoine Poitevin J^r and his wife
 Pierre Poitevin
 Joseph Marboeuf
 Jean Aunant and wife
 Solomon Bremar and wife
 Nicholas Bouchet and wife
 Daniel Trezevant J^r

nearly all of whom seem by the list to have been closely connected by blood or intermarriage. The compiler of the St: Julien list

³⁵ Ibid, pp. 15, 16, 17, 35.

or of that subdivision which contains the list of those at the Orange Quarter states at the foot that there were others whom he had not put down but who had been written down by the Committee, as "Mr. Vidot" and some others. The earliest French name found in the locality was as we have seen Pierre Fouré who transferred to Pierre St Julien prior to 1687. There are a number of grants in the vicinity to others than French settlers both prior and subsequent to that date and the majority of settlers even in the "Quarter" were not French, but the following are the French settlers in order of date of grant that the writer has found on the record.

NAMES	ACRES	DATE OF WARRANT	DATE OF GRANT
Nicholas de Longuemare.....	100	5 Jan'y 1685	17 Mch 1688/9
Peter du Tartre.....		28 Sept ^r 1696	28 Oct ^r 1696
Louis Juin.....	200	30 Oct ^r "	12 Dec ^r "
Abel Bochet.....	130		1 Sept ^r 1697
James de Bordeaux.....	400	26 July 1697	
Nicholas Bochet.....	100	9 Sept 1696	" " "
George Juin.....	100	26 " 1697	17 Aug. 1700
Peter Videau.....	250		11 Jany "
Humphrey Torquet.....	320	6 March 1696/7	" " "
John Aunant.....	300	28 May 1696	12 May 1703
Josias du Pré.....	730		18 Sept ^r "
Daniel Trezevant.....	330	25 March 1698	18 July 1703
Paul Torquet.....	450		6 May 1704
Peter Poitevin.....	400	12 May 1702	5 " "
Benjamin Simons.....	350		" " "
Alexander de la Motte.....	800	4 March 1702	" " "
John Carteau.....	200	3 Jany 1701/02	" " "
John Petineau.....	100	23 Aug 1704	6 July "
Philip Normand.....	150	23 Oct ^r 1697	5 May "
James Belin.....	210		" " "
Matthew Tullada (French ?).....	300	5 Jany 1704	15 Sept ^r 1705
Solomon Breinar.....	365	14 April 1705	" " "
Daniel Gobel (French ?).....	260		14 May 1707
Louis Mouzon.....	500	12 June 1708	undated
Louis du Tarque.....	600	6 July "	3 March 1708/9
Joseph Marboeuf.....	490	16 Mch 1708/9	19 May 1709
Anthony Bonneau.....	500	14 Dec ^r 1708	1 June "
Jacob Lapotre.....	1000		" " "
Daniel Brabant.....	500		24 Nov ^r "
Peter Caretonau.....	500		14 April 1710
Jeremiah Varine.....	360	31 July 1711	27 June 1711

Many of these persons were in the Province and were residents in the Orange Quarter before the apparent dates of these warrants. They seem to have gone into possession under some authority, leave, or agreement, prior to receiving warrants and grants. These names however constitute so far as the writer has been able to ascertain the names of the French settlers of that locality up to say 1711. They seem all to have settled there posterior to 1685 and if the date of settlement was the date of arrival then they could none have been the immigrants brought over by the *Richmond*.

The name "Orange Quarter" as applied to the settlement the writer first finds in the heading of one of the sublists of the St Julien list: viz; "Liste des noms des Fransioise qui se recueille "en l'Église du Cartie d'Orange." In the Church Act of 1706 a parish is provided for "in the Orange Quarter for the use of the "French Settlement there which shall be called by the name of "the parish of St: Dennis."

In the additional Act of 1708 it is again referred to in the same language, and in the Act of 1712 provision is made for the support of a "Minister of the parish of St: Dennis for the French settlement in Orange Quarter." By the tax Act of 1715 assessors or "enquirers" are appointed "for the parish of St: Dennis or "Orange Quarter, M^r. Peter Videau, M^r. Josiah Dupree and M^r. "Peter Poitvin."

How it acquired the name "Orange" Quarter the writer has never been able definitely to ascertain.

Howe in his *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina* published in 1870 states that it has been conjectured that the name was derived from the principality of Orange in the province of Avignon which at the period of the revocation belonged to William Prince of Orange afterwards King of England. He gives no authority for this conjecture. Shipp in his *History of Methodism in South Carolina* published in 1883 makes the same statement save that he makes it positively and leaves out the conjecture. M^c-Crady in his work published in 1897 follows Howe, quoting him as his authority. It may be remarked that Orange was originally an independent principality and not a part of the County or City of Avignon, which in turn was not a province so called, and that it did not belong to William at the period of the revocation of the

Edict of Nantes. He held the title of Prince of Orange but the principality outside of his personal estates had been annexed to the Crown of France. Not a single immigrant in the St: Julien list is entered as from Avignon, Orange, or the adjoining Comtat Venaissin, although two or three are stated as from Languedoc. The French settlers seem to have gone to the Orange Quarter between 1685 and 1696. William when invited over to England in 1688 was generally known as the Prince of Orange and not by the Dutch title of Stadtholder. It may be the section was called the Orange Quarter in compliment to his title. It is as Howe says a mere conjecture.

On Herman Moll's map of 1715 the section is denominated "St: Thomas Parish with y^e French Settlement at Orange Quarter "called St: Denis."

It does not seem to have retained the name Orange Quarter long after 1715. The name "French" Quarter seems to have superseded "Orange" and the creek from Cooper river through this settlement first known by the Indian name of Wisboo, or Wis-bo-o-e creek, and then as Lynch's creek, acquired the name of French Quarter creek which it still retains. In the mouths of the negro inhabitants of the section it has been now further altered from "French" to "Fresh" Quarter creek. The Orange Quarter roughly speaking covered the area bounded Northwardly by the grants to Cassique John Ashby, Eastwardly by the settlements beyond the headwaters of the creek, Southwardly by the English settlements on the Cooper river and Westwardly by the Eastern Branch of Cooper river. The grants to the French settlers lay thickly around the headwaters of Wisboo Creek.

The number of French settlers on the Eastern Branch of Cooper river i. e. at the Orange Quarter was given by Peter Girard a merchant in Charles Town as 101 in March 1698/9. Allowing five persons to each family (an estimate probably excessive at that date) it would give about twenty families which roughly speaking agrees with the then settlers as inferred from the data to which reference has already been made.

They probably had some church or congregational organization or meeting, for the St Julien sublist is of persons who attend the church in that quarter. That they had a Church edifice erected is not clear. There is on record a will of Caesar Mozé dated 20

June 1687³⁶ and probated 7 of July 1687, between which dates he must have died. By this will he devised to Nicholas Mayrant with whom he was then living "the plantation in which we are "jointly interested situated on the Eastern Branch of the T of "Cooper river" and bequeathed £37 sterling to the church of the French Protestant "refugees in this country of Carolina to be "used for the construction of a temple or place of assembly for "the said Protestant refugees which shall be built at the place "most conveniently near and in the vicinity of the said plantation "in which the said M^r. Mayrant and myself are interested."

The writer has not been able to locate the plantation on the Eastern Branch of the Cooper river in which according to Mozé Mayrant and himself were jointly interested. He has found neither warrant nor grant to either of them of that date for a tract of land in that locality. The will shows however that no church building had yet been erected and uses the word church "Eglise" in the sense of "congregation" not of edifice. Curiously enough M^r. Thomas Gaillard in the extract from his work published by the Huguenot Society says that the will of Caesar Mozé determines the fact that a congregation of French Protestants was in existence in *Charleston* in 1687 because he bequeaths to the church of the French Protestant refugees in Charleston! £37, whereas the bequest is plainly to the congregation on the Eastern Branch of Cooper River. So too the committee of that Society in its paper on the French Huguenots of South Carolina (prepared it is believed by the late D^r. Gabriel E. Manigault) referring to the church in the Orange Quarter, says it may be inferred from the bequest of Caesar Mozé that a house of public worship was erected in that quarter about the year 1690 thirteen years before the first Episcopal Church at Pompion Hill. But the will of Caesar Mozé shows only that he made the bequest for a church edifice to be built and the amount of the bequest £37. is hardly evidence that with it alone any sufficient building could be, and of course none that any such actually was, constructed. These forced inferences all proceed from the straining that has swayed sectarian writers and pamphleteers to show that some particular faith or "church" had precedence in its organiza-

³⁶ *Off. Hist. Comr. Will Book*, p. 283.

tion and construction on the soil of Carolina. An amusing illustration of this is the "myth" of Michael Loving.

Michael Loving or Lovering was one of several servants brought into the Province by Capt: John Coming in August 1671.³⁷ Two other servants brought over at the same time by Capt: Coming were John Chambers and Philip Orrill.³⁸ These three were on the 4th June 1672 brought by their Mistress M^{rs}. Affera Coming before the Grand Council for disobedience, Philip Orrill in especial having threatened to upset the boat in which she was, with other threats. After trial the Grand Council ordered Orrill to be tied to a tree and to receive 21 lashes on his naked back, and the other two admonished under pain of "condigne punishment" to render more dutiful obedience to the commands of their mistress.³⁹ On the 3^d March 1681/2 a warrant was issued to lay out to Michael Loving a Town lot in Charles Town;⁴⁰ and this was followed by a grant dated 6 March 1681/2 to Michael Lovinge of Town lot N^o 65.⁴¹ Thereafter on 24 Novr 1684 Michael Lovinge conveyed lot N^o 65 to Arthur Middleton, after whose death his widow to whom he had devised the lot and who had intermarried with Ralph Izard conveyed this lot to James Nicholls "for the use of "the Commonality of the French Church in Charles Town."⁴² No church building seems to have been built on this lot for some years for in 1701 the members of the French Huguenot congregation in Charles Town received from the Proprietors the grant of two lots N^{os} 92 and 93 on which to build a church. The warrant for these lots had been issued to J. F. Gignilliat and Stephen Douxsaint "for y^e building of a Church in behalfe of y^e ffrench "Protestants of this Province" as early as 9 Decr 1686 but no grant was issued until 14 Nov^r 1701 when it was issued to Henry Noble and Peter Buretell for the use of the French Protestants and the inference from the language of the grant would seem that they had as yet no church building constructed in Charleston.⁴³

³⁷ *Printed Warrants*, 1672-1679, p. 45.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Printed Journal Grand Council*, 1671-1680, p. 33.

⁴⁰ *Printed Warrants*, 1680-1692, p. 66.

⁴¹ *Grants*, vol. 38, p. 60.

⁴² *Off: Hist: Com^r: Bk. Grants Sales, etc., 1704-1708*, p. 250.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 252.

In 1725 someone compiled a list of the lots in Charles Town with the dates of the grants and on the line of lot 65 granted March 6th 1681 to Mich^l Loveing is written in the margin “(fr^{ch}. ch^{ch}), meaning evidently that that was the lot on which the French Church then stood. A complete copy of this list has been published in this *Magazine*.⁴⁴ The same or some other person seems at about the same time to have made the same annotation of “ffrench church” on the margin of the record of the grant—probably when he examined the record to make his list.

In 1886 there was published in the Charleston Year Book for the year 1885 an account of the Huguenot Church in Charleston the authorship of which has always been attributed to the late Rev. C. S. Vedder the then minister of that church.

In this the guess is made that Michael Loving was probably a French Huguenot whose true name was “Lovell” and that the marginal reference of “ffrench church” on the record of the grant and of “fr^{ch} ch^{ch}” on the margin of the list “seems to compel the conclusion that “it was given for the sacred purpose to which it “appears to have been ever since and is now devoted:” and that it is scarcely possible to doubt that the Huguenot Colonists of Charleston built their first sanctuary early in the year 1681 on the site where the beautiful church of their descendants now stands. The mere historian cannot but infer that no French church could have been built in 1681 on the lot granted to M^{rs}. Comings’ disobedient servant and subsequently owned by Arthur Middleton and Ralph Izard both church of England men, and not transferred to the French congregation until 1687, in the face also of the most plausible inference from the record being that no French Huguenot Church Building was constructed in Charleston until after 1701. Nevertheless since D^r. Veddars history of the church his statement has been repeated and referred to as established history until it is now perhaps hopeless to attempt to correct it. The same straining after priority of church organization appears in the account of the New England congregational settlement on Ashley River the historians of which have asserted that the communion celebrated by those settlers in February 1696 at their first services was the first sacrament of the Lord’s Supper ever celebrated in Carolina.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Vol. IX, p. 16.

⁴⁵ *S. C. Hist: and Gen: Mag.*, vol. VI, pp. 66, 69.

The writer has delved for many years in the records of the early settlers of Carolina and gives the following as his conclusion on the question of who "built the first church." He admits this suggestion is worth only so much as its merit, and logical probability will justify, and admits further that any day some more careful investigator may unearth some buried record that will put his theory to flight.

When the first settlers came they were more concerned with the affairs of protection from the elements and nourishment for the body, than with the construction of church buildings. Their first religious meetings (in good weather at least) were probably in the open, under the shelter of some umbrageous oak as was the case at old Dorchester.⁴⁶ As soon as they had roofs to shelter their religious meetings were probably at their homes, at different houses in succession.

The English were the first settlers. They had most people and most money and more than that they had the reins of government and the power of taxation. Every plan of a contemplated town had a place designated for the building of a church meaning thereby a church of the church of England. Culpepers plan of old Charles Town or Albemarle Point designates a place for such a church and apparently one was built there probably a humble structure of logs in the true original colonial style. At Oyster Point, new Charles Town, an early church of St. Philip was built where St. Michael now stands. The others, "sects" or "faiths" followed the same course. Huguenots, Congregationalists, Baptists, Quakers, as soon as they became numerous enough to need, and wealthy enough to build, a church building for use, instead of using the houses of the members, they did so. Guessing in the dark the writer would say the Congregationalists followed close after the Church of England, then the Huguenots, then the Baptists and then the Quakers.

So it was with the French settlers at Orange Quarter. They probably held services at one of the dwellings of the members of the congregation; perhaps at different dwellings in turn.

The only notice of the church at Orange Quarter at all contemporaneous, the writer has found, is that given by Dr. Humphrey in his account of the Missionaries sent to South Carolina by the

⁴⁶ *Hist. and Gen. Mag. of S. C.*, vol. VI, p. 69.

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts published in 1730.⁴⁷

He states that at the time of the division of the country into parishes (i.e. 1706) the Orange Quarter was part of St. Thomas' Parish. That the major part of the French settlement usually met together in a small church of their own where they generally made a full congregation when they had a French Minister amongst them: that they made application to the Assembly of the Province to be made into a parish and to have some public allowance for a minister, episcopally ordained, who should use the liturgy of the Church of England and preach to them in French. Accordingly they were incorporated by the name of the Parish of St. Denis. That they have now a good church built about the same time as the Parish Church of St. Thomas.

This petition to the Assembly was probably made about 1706 when the Parish of St. Denis was created. When the small church referred to by D^r. Humphrey was built is not stated. As the only Minister they had had at that time was M^r. Le Pierre who seems to have been "episcopally ordained" it is possible this small church was built for the use of the French congregation about the same time as the Chapel at Pompion Hill say 1703. The Parish Church of St. Thomas was commenced in 1707 and finished in 1708. About the same time a new church building was constructed for the French speaking members of the parish. The service was according to the liturgy of the English church, the prayer book used being a French translation of the Book of Common Prayers and the Minister being one "episcopally ordained." This continued until 1768 when there being no longer any occasion for a separate French service the use of the church was discontinued. The church building was probably of wood. At any rate it has so completely disappeared physically and traditionally that it was only with great difficulty and after long research that its approximate site could be located where it is indicated on the map of the plantation in St. Thomas on the Eastern Branch of the Cooper River published in the January 1917 number of this *Magazine*.

Why this parish was given the name of St. Denis is matter of

⁴⁷ Carroll's *Hist. Coll^{ns}*, vol. 2, p. 538.

conjecture. Howe states that the name was supposed to commemorate the battle field of St. Denis in the vicinity of Paris which was the scene of a memorable encounter in 1567 between the Catholic forces commanded by Montmorency and the Huguenots led by Admiral Coligny and the Prince of Condé, in which Montmorency was slain. His conjecture is again repeated by Shipp and McCrady but it is scarcely plausible. The encounter at St. Denis was really only a small incident which terminated to the disadvantage of the Huguenots although Montmorency received the wound of which he died.

If they had desired to record a victory for their arms they would most naturally have turned to the battle of Ivry.

The Presbyterians and French Huguenots do not seem to have given the names of Saints to their churches. The name of St. Denis was probably conferred by the Church of England Assembly to whom the application had been made and who created the Parish. The patron Saint of France was St. Denis and in giving a Saint's name to a French parish it was not unnatural to select his name. It is a case however of pure conjecture.

The number of French settlers in the Parish of St. Thomas including St. Denis as a whole was much less than the number of English settlers. The list of early grantees shows a great preponderance of English, the latter being well sandwiched in, even on the waters of the French Quarter Creek. In fact the entire French settlement in South Carolina bore numerically a very small proportion to the entire population. They settled to any extent in but four places outside of Charles Town. A very small settlement at the head of Goose Creek; a small settlement on and near Biggon Swamp in St. John's Berkley; the settlement at Orange Quarter, another settlement on the Santee in the neighborhood of French Jamestown. The entire number of French persons in the Province in March 1698-1699 as given by Peter Girard a merchant in Charles Town and himself a French immigrant was 438.⁴⁸ The entire white population at the same period is estimated at 5500.⁴⁹ Not an estimate based on any satisfactory data. If correct however the French settlers then formed less than ten per cent of the total white population. After that date the

⁴⁸ Rivers' *Hist: Sketch of S. C.*, p. 447.

⁴⁹ McCrady, *S. C. under the Proprietary Government*, pp. 338, 722.

French accessions were apparently proportionately few while the flood of English immigration flowed on increasingly. The parts of the country occupied by the French were substantially limited to a part of St. James Santee—that part known as French Santee—a small part of the Parish of St. Thomas a very small settlement on St. James Goose Creek and a small settlement in St. John's Berkley, and their occupation as a rule continued to be restricted to those localities although a few individuals went elsewhere in the other parishes. The other low country parishes covering the great bulk of the low country viz. All Saints on Waccamaw, Prince Fredericks, Prince George's, St. Stephens, Christ Church, St. James Goose Creek, St. George Dorchester, St. Andrews, St. John's Colleton, St. Pauls, St. Bartholomew, and all of Beaufort (then Granville) County were almost exclusively English with also the larger portion of St. James Santee, St. Johns Berkley and St. Thomas. Allowing for all subsequent intermarriages and female descents it would seem impossible to estimate the French element in the population of the sea coast counties of South Carolina at more than one or two per cent of the whole. This necessarily is very largely conjectural. In the remainder of the state say in two thirds of its area the French element is practically nil. The small settlement at New Bordeaux in Abbeville County being too small to be noticeable. So far as the settlement at the Orange Quarter is concerned it has disappeared: the writer knows of not a single tract of land now held there by any one having a French name.

The small holdings of the first French settlers at Orange Quarter proper, were comparatively soon absorbed in the larger estates but even as regards the large tracts along the Eastern Branch of the Cooper River and adjacent thereto which were held by the Hegers, the Manigaults, the Bonneaus, the Lesesnes, the Laurens, but one small plantation, Campvere, is now owned by the bearer of a French name or even a descendant of the former owners, unless M^r. Elias Cumbee the present owner of the North Hampton plantation be a descendant of Philip Combé one of the French settlers. They retained their "grip" so to say along the Eastern Branch of Cooper River until the war of 1860-1865 but that cataclysm was as destructive in its results in St. Thomas and on the Eastern Branch of Cooper as elsewhere in the low country and perhaps from several causes more completely so.